DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 202 FL 019 644

AUTHOR Toury, Gideon
TITLE "Everything Has Its Price": An Alternative to Normative Conditioning in Translator Training.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 16p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Decision Making; Foreign Countries; *Interpretive Skills; *Language Styles; *Norms; Professional Training; *Socialization; *Translation

ABSTRACT

For translators to gain acknowledgement and recognition, they must acquire a set of translation norms. Norms are specific to sociocultural context, and at the same time are inherently changeable. Translators need to be aware of these characteristics. Because no translation training program can impart to students the whole complex of translation norms, even in a single culture, specialization has increased and the notion of social appropriateness in translation has been pushed aside. When trainees enter the real world of translation they must unlearn part of what they were taught and adjust to prevalent norms of appropriateness. What students are offered is generally only a series of directives for making translation decisions. Instead, students should be trained to consider what would be gained by taking a certain translation approach, what would be sacrificed, whether the gain is worth the loss, and whether there are alternatives with a better balance of gain and loss. Exercises to accomplish this objective include the following: (1) analysis of existing translations with no evaluative purpose in mind but to describe and explain them; and (2) translation in a particular style. This approach could open students' eyes to the many possible translation norms. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Toury, G

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Gideon Toury
Tel Aviv University, Israel

"EVERYTHING HAS ITS PRICE":
An Alternative to Normative Conditioning in Translator Training

ED339202

It has been some fifteen years since I first put the notion of **translation norms** on the agenda, namely, in the pioneering conference on "Literature and Translation" held in Leuven (Belgium) in April 1976 (Toury 1978). Since then, the conception of translation as a norm-governed activity has been widely accepted and incorporated into various theoretical and methodological frameworks.

Unfortunately, however, several ideas which have gained currency in translation **theory** and put to use in various **descriptive-explanatory** studies still need to be propagated in the context of meta-thinking about the **teaching** of translation. Unless they are, there will be no real chance of finding them implemented in the curriculum; not even as a topic for open discussion, much less so as a guiding principle for the teaching itself. The object of what follows is precisely to put the notion of translation norms on the agenda again and draw some tentative conclusions from their all-pervasiveness for an alternative rationale of translation teaching.

1. Norms in Translation: Some Basic Traits

1.1. However highly one may think of disciplines such as linguistics, text-linguistics, contrastive textology or pragmatics and their possible implications for the study and teaching of translation, my own starting-point has always been the contention that "translatorship" is never reducible to the mere performance of acts which would be defined as "translation" in terms of any of those disciplines. What being a translator in "real-life" situations amounts to is playing a **social role**; fulfilling a part allotted by a community to this activity and its practitioners.

This claim is tantamount to saying that one of the basic conditions for becoming an acknowledged translator is **gaining recognition in this capacity**; and, indeed, recognition by

FL019644

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a societal group is a much stronger factor in the establishment of the identity of a translator than any way of actually performing the act, let alone the so-called "quality" of its end-products, especially if the criteria for determining this alleged quality are divorced from the conditions pertinent to the society and culture where the activity takes place and whose needs it is designed to serve.

Thus, I am more than convinced that each one of us could easily, on the spur of the moment, produce a list of individuals who have gained wide recognition as translators in his or her society while skipping parts of the texts they are translating, making elementary mistakes on the linguistic level, flattening the style of the original, making do with a recurrent, limited linguistic repertory, irrespective of the assignment, etc., etc.; in brief, committing all that is so often - especially in teaching and learning contexts - presented as gross "offenses" against "the very gist" of translation. The more experienced among us may even be able to assign the names on their list to certain schools where these individuals were trained, or particular cultural milieus where their behaviour as translators was shaped (which is even now the normal case in many cultures, and almost everywhere - with respect to translators of literary texts). Finally, while the lists compiled by members of one and the same speech community are likely to agree, to a great extent, the compilers may well differ substantially as to whether all those on the lists actually "deserve" to be on them.

1.2. What granting social recognition to translators in fact requires is first and foremost the acquisition of a certain set of **norms** shared by the group in question; be they a mere projection of the norms governing verbal communication in general onto translation (which some of them often are), or specific norms pertinent to "communication in translated utterances" (Toury 1980:11-18), or even particular types of translation; particular in terms of medium, or channel (e.g. oral vs. written), type of utterance to be translated and/or produced (which needn't be the same, of course!), circumstances under which the act itself takes place, or whatever.

Norms constitute a vital link between general attitudes, on the one hand, and actual behaviour, on the other. As sociologists and social psychologists have taught us, they are basically

> the translation of general values or ideas shared by a certain community - as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate - into specific performance-instructions appropriate for and applicable to specific situations, providing they are not [yet] formulated as laws. (Toury 1980: 51)[1]

The difficulties in accounting for this link, and in any serious attempt to impart it to students in situations of formal training, lie first and foremost in two features of norms: their **socio-cultural specificity** (Section 1.3) and inherent **changeability** (Section 1.4).

1.3. Thus, whatever its exact content, there is absolutely no need that a norm will apply - to the same extent, or at all - to **different sectors within a society**. Even less so is there a need, or indeed a chance, that the same norms will apply **across cultures**. In fact, sameness of norms is often a mere coincidence - or else the result of continuous contacts between sectors or entire cultures, that is, a manifestation of so-called "interference". Moreover, even in cases of this last kind, very often it is more a matter of **apparent identity** than a genuine one, because the different systems in which the norms are embedded lend each one of them a different value (in the systemic sense of the word, which has nothing to do with its meaning in evaluative contexts).

Let us take the **principles of segmentation** applied to written texts as a case in point. To be sure, the claim that these principles follow universal patterns is a figment of the imagination of modern discourse and text theoreticians intent on uncovering as many universal principles as possible. In actual fact, which also found its reflection in traditional rhetorics, there have been many different traditions (or "models") of segmentation, and the differences between them - whether taken into account or ignored, all in accordance with the norms governing the recipient sector (or culture) - always have implications for translation. To be sure, even the segmentation of the Old Testament itself was often "tampered with" by its translators, so as to bring it closer to target cultural habits.

Thus, in one sector (the translation of prose fiction for children, for example), or one culture (such as the pre-Israeli Hebrew one), domestic principles of segmentation may be highly favoured, to the effect that most texts which undergo translation will also undergo re-segmentation according to these principles. In another sector (the translation of prose fiction for adults, or a non-specified audience, for example), or another culture, sticking to the

original segmentation in a rather mechanical way may be preferred, be its principles ever so alien to the target culture. Finally, there is also a possibility of striking all sorts of compromise between the requirements of the two extremes - if that's what the norm deems appropriate. To be sure, non-normative behaviour is always a possibility too. However, there may well be a price to it; for instance, a culturally-determined need exhibited by publishers, or other mediators, to submit the translation to heavy editing. Needless to say, this, and other types of "negative sanction", may well interfere with granting the translator the sought-for recognition, which is what we wished to focus on.

1.4. In addition to their inherent culture-specificity, the norms governing translation - like any other norms, in any other behavioural domain - are also unstable, **changing** entities; not only in principle, but in practice too.

At times, changes of norms may be rather quick (as was the case, for instance, with Hebrew culture of the last two centuries, which started off lagging behind its European host and neighbouring cultures and changed rapidly in a deliberate attempt to imitate and catch up with them). At other times, the process can be much slower. However, not too seldom is it the case that substantial changes of translational norms occur **within one's life-time**; be he the producer of translated utterances, their initiator or their client.

To be sure, these traits of norms have so far been demonstrated first and foremost for literary translation, but this is only because it was mainly this sector which was studied under this aspect. I am positive that future research will come up with very similar results for *any* kind of translation, including, e.g., conference interpreting, as has been recently claimed and demonstrated by Miriam Shlesinger (1989) and Brian Harris (1990) in an all too snatched exchange of views in *Target*.

1.5. As is so well-known, complying with social pressures to readjust one's normative behaviour is far from simple. In fact, most people, including translators, initiators of translations and their consumers, do so only up to a point. Consequently, it is not all that rare to find in a society **three sets of competing norms**, each one with its own groups of adherents and position in culture at large: the one which dominates the center of the system, and hence directs translational behaviour in the so-called "mainstream", alongside with the

remnants of previous sets of norms and the rudiments of new ones. This is why it is possible to speak of being "trendy", "old-fashioned" or "progressive" with respect to translation (or any single section thereof, not just literary translation) as it is with respect to any other dimension of socio-cultural behaviour.

Obviously enough, one's status as "trendy" or "progressive" may well be temporary, especially if one fails to adjust, or does so to an insufficient extent. Thus, as changes of norms occur, a formerly "progressive" translator may soon find himself or herself just "trendy", on occasion even "*passé*". A mere mode? This is one way of putting it, which clearly reflects negative attitudes. However, this is precisely the way society and culture operate, whether one likes it or not; and translation is nothing but exempt from these processes. Nor should it be.

1.6. Needless to say, in their very behaviour, translators themselves contribute to the change of norms. So do translation criticism, translation ideology emanating from the academy (and often guised as theory) and, of course, institutes for the training of translators. Unfortunately, the exact role of these different agents in the overall cultural dynamics will remain a matter of mere conjecture until studied in depth. One thing seems clear, though: very little can be achieved by playing down other forces which are operative in society and culture, not even by teachers of translation. Any wish to flatten out differences, whether within a society or cross-culturally, is bound to fail. Apart from it, it amounts to **cultural colonialism**, which is something we should have outgrown, towards the end of the 20th century.

2. The Neglect of Translation Norms in Translation Teaching

2.1. The heterogeneity and changeability alone, which are so inherent to the concept of norm, are powerful enough to undermine the best of intentions in translation teaching. On top of it, much as in the mastery of language itself, gaining social recognition in one's capacity as a full-fledged producer of appropriately translated utterances of various types, to suit varying socio-cultural requirements and needs, is a highly involved process. It requires much more than the mere acquisition of a host of norms, with their differences and partial

overlapping, which is difficult enough in itself. It also involves the ability to **maneouvre** between various sets of norms, select the one that would be most appropriate for the situation at hand and behave in accordance with it - while keeping the door open to adjustment, even complete switch to a different kind of behaviour, governed by an alternative set of norms, if need arise.

When it comes to foreign language teaching, no syllabus so much as pretends to tackle the entirety of the situation. Normally, only a small number of language varieties are dwelt on, or else a small number of features which constitute the area which is common to many, if not all of them; a kind of "average language", if you wish. The inevitable result, which we are all very much aware of, is that students who are given no opportunity to counterbalance the input they have had in class, first and foremost by leading an active life in a community where the language is actually spoken, these students will normally be marked, maybe for life, as producing **artificial** utterances, at least in some of the situations they may find themselves in.

Similarly, no translation program can hope to impart to its students within two to four years the whole complex associated with translational norms, not even in one single culture; for which reason "specialization" and "professionalization" have become key-concepts in so many institutes for the training of translators.

2.2. This in itself is a given fact, not a criticism of any sort. What deserves to be criticized, though, is that, even in the narrowed-down frameworks offered to the students, **social appropriateness has often been pushed to the periphery**, if not completely lost sight of as a guiding principle. Many translation programs do not take it as their object to establish in the accelerated pace made possible by a graded syllabus well-rounded, "native-like" translators; better equipped than the ones who emerge under "natural" circumstances[2] - that is, more aware of what they are doing, hence with a greater ability to argue their cases - but basically operating within the norms which constitute their own culture. To be sure, not infrequently, social appropriateness and its implications for translation and translation teaching have not simply been lost sight of, but deliberately replaced; namely, by an aspiration to (re)define society's own requirements for it. No wonder that many programs purport to "improve" a deplorable situation; not that of their students, but that of the profession as a whole.

Obviously enough, whether something is an improvement on something else is always a matter of dispute. What is hardly disputable is that it involves a change; in our case of the very rationale underlying translation teaching: from catering to the needs of a society - to telling that society what it should need.

In fact, I cannot but wonder whether it is really within the mandate of a translation program as bestowed on it by society itself. After all, these programs came into being as a response to a genuine need to institutionalize the granting of social recognition to translators, a need which arose in certain societies and with respect to particular sectors of translation, by no means all of them. An official document was now offered to individuals who satisfied a series of requirements, a diploma which was to give them a little more than mere satisfaction; it was also designed to be taken seriously by institutions, sometimes even individuals, who would eventually employ its holders as translators. Certain institutes were entrusted with the setting of these requirements and the assessment of whether they were indeed satisfied, and the same (or sometimes different) institutes then took it upon themselves to train those interested in becoming licensed as translators.

2.3. To be sure, at present, it is often not all that easy to discern the intended profile of a graduate of a translation program, in terms of his or her role and status in society. Should s/he be "trendy" and strive to occupy a "good place in the middle", or have more "progressive" aspirations, maybe so much as "avant garde"? Or conversley, have "old-fashioned", maybe even "obsolete" attitudes towards his professional duties? Normally, this can hardly be answered on a general, "ideological" level, for the simple reason that the question has not been posed in this way. Nor could it, given the abandonment of social appropriateness as a governing principle.

As against it, the results of this change of orientation are often quite clear. One of its common outcomes is, again, that when a graduate leaves the greenhouse of the program, goes out into the "real world" and starts functioning within a society and for it, s/he is often marked as precisely that, namely, the graduate of a program, often the graduate of one particular translation program, or even the disciple of one particular teacher. Much the same as we have had with the mastery of language (Section 2.1), only somehow, this time there are many who would rather close their eyes to the fact, or even regard it favourably, in the name

of the wish to tell society what it actually needs. Ideologically questionable, this may nevertheless function, from time to time: translation norms can indeed change under the influence of translation teaching (see Section 1.6). However, my impression is that, more often than not, the poor graduates will rather have to undergo a painful process of *Verlernen*, that is, forget at least part of what they were taught and adjust to prevalent norms of appropriateness. Ignoring this factor while setting up teaching goals and methods may thus prove detrimental to the students themselves.

2.4. One thing that is normally ignored in the teaching context, and deliberately so, is the results of **descriptive studies**, where things have been found out about the behaviour of translators - as individuals and members of a societal group alike - as well as the make-up of translated utterances, which the teacher often finds displeasing. For instance, the claim that interference is a universal concomitant of translation,[3] or that in translation, target-language items are normally selected on a level which is *lower* than the one where so-called "textual relations" can be established for the source text (what Barbara Folkart once called "the entropisation of the text"),[4] or that the extent to which a text is taken as a constraint on the formulation of its translation is not a direct function of the importance of that text in the *source* culture, but of the requirements of the *recipient* system. There are many more findings of this kind, whose prevalence had better be known - and taken into account - even if the aspiration is to achieve their exact opposite. Probably in these cases in particular, for waging war against known factors (if such a war is deemed advisable, in the first place) would be much easier.

3. Normative Conditioning in Translator Training

3.1. What the students are offered instead is often not much more than a bunch of **directives for making translation decisions**. Those directives themselves draw on an interesting admixture of concepts borrowed from more "respectable" sources than real-world experience, mainly disciplines such as linguistics, text-linguistics or pragmatics, plus intuitions, often very good ones, and seasoned with a speck of wishful thinking. In the most extreme cases, the claim is even made (at least implicitly) that there are fool-proof methods

of arriving at optimal translation solutions; an almost mathematical series of steps which could almost be represented in a flow-chart. "Mate in seven moves", as it were. For example:

- refer a source language item to a problem-area (e.g., metaphor),
- narrow down the general area by choosing the appropriate label from an existing list (e.g., living metaphor, dead metaphor, cliché, or simile),
- analyze the surface representation of the problem-item with the help of the principles which underlie with the label, or the whole list,
- determine the type of text (which will normally be tantamount to stating the prototypical function and use of your item),
- cross the various data, and in their intersection the proper type of translational replacement will be found, ready and waiting for you (e.g., a non-metaphor, a living metaphor, a cliché, etc.).
- The only thing left to do is realize this type in linguistic material of the target language (to which too, many "prototypical" examples are often given).

This, in fact, is one of the most common techniques which are taught to students who do not wish to achieve much more than passing an exam... And students' expectations is something we will soon return to (Section 3.4).

3.2. Let me cite, by way of an example, a series of directives offered to translation students with respect to precisely "The Translation of Metaphor" by one highly influential teacher and author. These normative pronouncements seem to me a consequential, if extreme outcome of the change of approach which I've been trying to sketch. Typically enough, the main VERBS resorted to are prototypical directives such as *should*, *must* and *have to* (or their antonyms). The following series of brief quotations are all taken from less than two consecutive pages (Newmark 1981: 93-94), but there are many more of this kind to be found in the same chapter and throughout the book (all emphases are mine; - G.T.):[5]

> "the image of an original metaphor, unlike that of a stock metaphor, *should* normally be transferred [in translation]", **OR:** "[the personal element in original metaphor] *has to be* translated by primary meanings" (p. 93), **OR:** "similes [creeping into medical texts] *should be* retained (as against metaphors)", **OR:** "whether these metaphors *should be* reproduced semantically (by equivalent metaphor or sense) depends on whether they are written for accurate description (the true purpose of metaphor [sic!] or merely for

> **effect, for ornament, for sensation, its main media-use [sic!]", OR: "in serious non-literary texts, original or recent metaphors *must be* treated with the same respects as those in serious literature" (p. 94).**

3.3. What is so upsetting here is not any single directive in itself, let alone the very need felt by authors, or teachers, to formulate instructions and try to impart them to other, less experienced parties. After all, my very claim has been that the acquisition of norms is a basic condition for becoming acknowledged as a translator! What bothers me is not even the attempt to lay down rules for the treatment of an assortment of "problems" on the micro level, as if one would ever be called upon to translate a "problem" such as metaphor in isolation, and not texts embedded in certain contexts,[6] which, on top of all, pose problems of various types all at once. What is most irritating is the false pretense under which the directives are so often presented; namely, not as being in constant competition with other norms, hence marking one of many **possible** modes of behaviour, but as **"best"**, if not **absolute** principles, derived in a **"logical"** way (which is, of course, only one of several possible kinds of logic) from **universals** which are not always that universal (such as Newmark's own claim that "in any informative text", "only facts (or theories) are sacred" [1981: 87]).[7]

What I find so symptomatic of translation **teaching** (as opposed to translation **theory** and the descriptive-explanatory **study** of translation) is the fact that the book I've been citing from gained so much popularity, and had such a strong impact; not only in Britain, where it was written and published and to whose needs it may have been geared, but in many other countries too, where translation is carried out into languages other than English, and where the socially and culturally relevant requirements are not necessarily the same.

3.4. To be sure, the fact that teachers do have the power to enforce norms on their students often results in an irresistible temptation to exert this power. On the other hand, many students too prefer to have an authority impose narrowly-defined modes of behaviour on them and train them in the "appropriate" application of rigid principles. Insecure as they are, they simply like to "play it safe" in the classroom, where they are constantly under observation, not to mention exam situations, where the teacher's power can be exerted almost to capacity (grades, grades...).

To be sure, as descriptive, including experimental studies into translation have demonstrated, a substantial portion of the translation process is indeed **automatic** (or **proceduralized**, as some psycholinguists would have it). It also stands to reason that the process of becoming a professional involves the acquisition of more, and more elaborate routines. In fact, this automatization, apart from being a fact of life, also pays nice dividends: it saves the translator a lot of time and effort and enables him to concentrate on what is really new, or in any way problematic to him. However, acting automatically in too early a stage, especially under the pressure of directives which have been supplied from without, may well be detrimental to the evolution of a translator-in-the-making, which is gradual in its very nature. What the trainee really needs is an opportunity to abstract his own guiding principles and routines from actual instances of behaviour, with the help of as variegated as possible responses to his performance. Thus, during training period, the pedagogically most suitable key-concepts are those associated with **experiencing**, **exploration** and **discovery**, not narrow normative conditioning.

4. The Game of Competing Norms in the Class

4.1. What this last claim amounts to is, in fact, a plea for partial implementation of the process whereby bilingual speakers gradually become translators under "natural" circumstances (that is, within a society and its requirements - but with no formal training in translation).

To be sure, this is NOT a plea for the imitation of the model of **socialization** *re* **translation** (for which see Toury 1984, 1986) in its entirety. This would be senseless from a practical as well as a methodological point of view. After all, the schooling system has developed various features which mark it as "non-natural" in its very essence, and the price for giving them up may simply be too high. Above all, the curriculum makes it possible to construct **ordered syllabi** in pursue of **consciously - and explicitly - formulated goals**, thus saving time and money. Then again, a syllabus is simply much more focussed, much less diffuse than any assortment of "real-life" situations one may accidentally find oneself in. The graded progression of the studies also makes it possible to bypass certain types of error, which is good - as long as ample room for some mistakes is left. After all, experiencing has an element of "trial-and-error" to it!

4.2. Those were some of the advantages of the curriculum. As to its flaws, one of the major ones has to do with the fact that the environmental feedback that a trainee normally finds himself or herself exposed to tends to be rather limited; not only, not even mainly, in strict **numerical** terms, but first and foremost in terms of its relative **one-sidedness**. After all, most of the responding agents, and certainly all those that count, are teachers. To ensure proper preparation for "real-life" situations, this one-sidedness deserves to be mitigated, namely, by exposing the student to additional kinds of response, even if these be less "professional". These responses may be much more "intuitive" in nature, but, as such, they are also likely to be more representative of society at large.

To cater for a greater variety of attitudes within the schooling system itself, tutors could be hired who are pronounced **non-conformists**. Moreover, care should be taken not to press those "trouble-makers" too hard to adjust, otherwise the whole justification for hiring them would soon be lost. In addition, the students themselves should be encouraged to respond to their peers' performance, even downright assess it; give their opinion as well as outright grade it. Moreover, students' assessments should be taken very seriously, maybe even serve as a basis for the final grade of some of the assignments; and it should be made clear to the students just how important a part their evaluation would play, so that they too will take this task of theirs seriously.

4.3. Above all, training time is the time to introduce the students to the **give-and-take** inherent in translation. They should be made aware of the fact that there are very many factors which may act as constraints on the process, its products and the way those products will be received at the target end, and that their job is precisely to manoeuvre among those constraints, such as for every gain something will necessarily be given up.

What I suggest, then, is that - in lieu of mere normative conditioning - the principle of **EVERYTHING HAS ITS PRICE** be adopted as a guide for both translational behaviour and its teaching. In accordance with this maxim, students would be trained to consider themselves what would be gained by making each decision, what would have to be sacrificed, whether the gain would be worth the loss - and whether there are no alternative modes of behaviour where the balance between gain and loss could be deemed more appropriate. ("*More*

appropriate", I say, and not downright "appropriate", in order not to smuggle in the narrow normative criteria that I have rejected through the back door.)

4.4. Of course, it may well be the case that the solutions arrived at in such a process of inner negotiation will often be very similar to those advocated by the external authorities. After all, teachers and textbook authors are often experienced - and acknowledged - translators in their own cultures who resort to this same method when they do active translating. However, even in this case, the status of these solutions, being the result of **genuine decision-making**, would be very different, offering as they do a strong element of achievement. To my mind, this is an important pedagogical merit. Decisions reached in this conscious way would also be explainable and/or defendable in more rational terms; arguments of "gain" vs. "loss" simply make much more sense than religious-like squabbles on whether or not something is carried out the way it allegedly "should". In fact, this kind of arguing one's case should be brought right into the classroom as part of its routine; students counter students as well as students counter teacher!

4.5. One enlightening way of coming to grips with the idea that, in translation, there are always several ways to go and that, moreover, it is never the case that only one of them is legitimate, is to have the students (and teachers!) analyze existing translations **with no evaluative purpose in mind**. This analysis would rather be geared towards the account of the make-up of translated texts, present and past, and the relationships obtaining between them and their sources, a *descriptive* phase which would then be followed by an attempt to supply *explanations* for the regularities observed.[8]

This exercise could be supplemented by an active attempt at applying the governing principles uncovered in the mini-descriptive studies. Thus, students could try their hand at translating - especially literary texts in the wide sense (including, e.g., religious and philosophical texts) - the way translator X might have done it, the way it would normally have been done in period Y, or the like. Often enough this would result in **translating in opposition to the norms which now dominate the field**; this time, however - due to the nature of the exercise - with no fear of negative sanctions, which I regard as an important merit of this little game. This, in fact, is the way my old-time suggestion to train translators "so as to

violate translational norms" (Toury 1980a) should be understood: not as an end in itself, but as an exercise whose aim is to open the students' eyes to the multiplicity of possible translational norms and help them find **their own way** through this dark forest.

Notes

[1] See also Nord's recent attempt to account for translation norms in the framework of the so-called *Skopostheorie* (Nord 1991).

[2] For a more detailed discussion of the notions of "native" vs. "natural" translation and their relevance to the emergence of translators see Toury 1984, 1986. See also Harris, 1973, 1977, 1978, and Harris and Sherwood 1978.

[3] See, e.g., Toury 1978a, 1982, 1982a; Vehmas-Lehto 1989; Weissbrod 1990.

[4] See, e.g., Ben-Ari 1988; Toury 1991, in press.

[5] In an interview with Geoffrey Kingscott, published recently in *Language International* (2:4 [1990], 15-18), Professor Newmark complained that I wasn't interested in him (p. 16). I take this compaint as an open invitation to demonstrate that having an interest in one's work does not imply agreeing with it.

[6] In this connection, it seems highly instructive that Newmark is also strongly opposed to any detailed textual analysis as a preparatory stage for making translational decisions (e.g., Newmark 1981: 91). Is it because such an analysis may sometimes undermine the allegedly all-pervasive validity of his instructions?

[7] Obviously enough, no text can be regarded as a "pure" representation of a textual model, or a "text-type", and what stands for translation is always individual texts taken out of the world of our experience and the translation act is designed to return them into it in a new garment; whether in a similar or a (more or less) different function.

[8] And see my recent discussion of "What are Descriptive Studies into Translation Likely to Yield apart from Isolated Descriptions?" (Toury in press).

References

Ben-Ari, Nitsa. 1988. *Norms Underlying Translation of German Literature into English, French and Italian*. Tel Aviv University: Department of Poetics & Comparative Literature. [M.A. Thesis]

Harris, Brian. 1973. "La traductologie, la traduction naturelle, la traduction automatique et la sémantique". *Cahiers de Linguistique* 10. [unpaged]

Harris, Brian. 1977. "The Importance of Natural Translation". *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 12: 96-114.

Harris, Brian. 1978. "The Difference between Natural and Professional Translation". *Canadian Modern Language Review* 34: 417-427.

Harris, Brian. 1990. "Norms in Interpretation". *Target* 2:1. 115-119.

Harris, Brian and Bianca Sherwood. 1978. "Translation as an Innate Skill". In: *Language, Interpretation and Communication*, eds. David Gerver and H. Wallace Sinaiko. New York-London: Plenum Press, 1978. 155-170.

Newmark, Peter. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Nord, Christiane. 1991. "Scopos, Loyalty, and Translational Conventions". *Target* 3:1. 91-109.

Shlesinger, Miriam. 1989. "Extending the Theory of Translation to Interpretation: Norms as a Case in Point". *Target* 1:1. 111-115.

Toury, Gideon. 1978. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation". In: *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, eds. James S Holmes, José Lambert and Raymond van den Broeck. Leuven: acco, 1978. 83-100. (rep. in Toury 1980: 51-62.)

Toury, Gideon. 1978a. "Interlanguage and Its Manifestations in Translation". *Meta* 24:2. 223-231. 1979. (rep. in Toury 1980: 71-78)

Toury, Gideon. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Toury, Gideon. 1980a. "The Translator as a Nonconformist-to-be, or: How to Train Translators So As to Violate Translational Norms". In: *Angewandte Übersetzungswissenschaft: Internationales übersetzungswisseschaftliches Kolloquium an der Wirtschaftsuniversität Århus/Dänemark, 19.-21. Juni 1980*, eds. Sven-Olaf Poulsen and Wolfram Wilss. Århus/Dänemark, 1980. 180-194.

Toury, Gideon. 1982. "Transfer as a Universal of Verbal Performance of L2 Learners in Situations of Communication in Translated Utterances". *FINLANCE: The Finnish Journal of Language Learning and Teaching* II. 63-78.

Toury, Gideon. 1982a. "The Communication Situation and the Production of Interference Forms by L2 Learners". *RELC Journal* (Singapore) 13:2. 62-77.

Toury, Gideon. 1984. "The Notion of 'Native Translator' and Translation Teaching". In: *Die Theorie des Übersetzens und ihr Aufschlußwert für die Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschdidaktik*. Tübingen: Narr, 186-195.

Toury, Gideon. 1986. "Natural Translation and the Making of a Native Translator". *TEXTconTEXT* 1:1. 11-29.

Toury, Gideon. 1991. "In Quest of Laws of Translational Behaviour". Paper read at the Fifth International Conference on Fundamental Questions of Translation Studies: "Alternative Models of Translation in Teaching and Research", University of Leipzig.

Toury, Gideon. in press. "What are Descriptive Studies into Translation Likely to Yield apart from Isolated Descriptions?" in: *Proceedings of the First James S Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies*, ed. Kitty van Leuven-Zwart. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri. 1989. *Quasi-Correctness: A Critical Study of Finnish Translations of Russian Journalistic Texts*. Helsinki.

Weissbrod, Rachel. 1990. "Linguistic Interference in Literary Translations from English into Hebrew of the 1960s and 1970s". *Target* 2:2. 165-181.